

REMARKS

Claims 53-72 are currently pending. Claims 62-64 have been amended in this response. The Examiner has indicated that claim 62 would be allowable if amended to overcome the Section 112 rejections as discussed below.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for his consideration during the telephone interview of June 28, 2006. During the telephone interview, applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the claimed invention and possible claim amendments.

The Examiner has rejected claim 62 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Even though applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position, applicant has amended claim 62 to address the Examiner's concern. As agreed to by the Examiner during the June 28, 2006 telephone interview, claim 62 with the foregoing amendments overcomes the Section 112, first paragraph, rejection. Support for the amended subject matter can be found at, for example, page 12, lines 18-31, and page 13, lines 5-14 of the specification.

The Examiner has rejected claims 62-64 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Without commenting on or conceding the merits of the rejections, applicant has amended claims 62-64 to address the Examiner's concern.

The Examiner has rejected claims 53-57, 61, and 63-69 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonoyama in view of Schanel, and claims 58-60 and 70-72 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonoyama in view of Schanel and further in view of Hayashi. Even though applicant respectfully disagrees with the basis of these rejections, applicant has amended independent claims 63 and 64 to incorporate the features of allowable claim 62. As agreed to by the Examiner during the June 28 telephone interview, the combination of Sonoyama, Schanel, and Hayashi cannot form the basis of Section 103(a) rejections of these claims. For example, claims 53-61 and 63-72

recite "the received thresholds and indicators can be different for each task," which is neither taught nor suggested by any of the cited references.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any question or believes that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-6038.

Dated: 8/1/06

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Chen Liang

Registration No.: 51,945
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant